

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 6-10 have been newly added herewith.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ciesemier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,344,060). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the following arguments.

Claim 1 sets forth a fuse including a fuse element and an insulating housing. The insulating housing includes a flap integrally formed at one side edge of a slit opening and has a *distal end* edge which is joined to another edge of the slit opening. For example, the non-limiting embodiment of Fig. 3 illustrates a flap 21b which is integrally formed at an edge of the slit opening at the thin-walled hinge 28. A distal end 22 of the flap 21b, which is the end farthest from the end at which the flap is integrally formed with the housing, is joined to another side edge of the slit opening by locking pawl 23.

The Ciesemier flap 60 is deficient at least because it lacks a distal end edge joined to another side edge of a slit opening. In Ciesemier, the flap is secured by shoulders 8a formed on the terminal blades 8 (*see* Figs. 4 and 8A). These shoulders 8a secure sides of the flap 60, but do not join a distal end of the flap. Therefore, the distal end, which is the end opposite the integrally connected end, is not joined to an edge of a slit opening. Because only the sides of flap which are not the distal end are joined to an edge of the slit opening by the shoulders 8a, there is nothing which joins the distal end of the flap 60 to an edge of the slit opening. Accordingly, Ciesemier fails to teach every feature of claim 1 and claim 1 is allowable over Ciesemier.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
APPLN. NO. 10/614,046

DOCKET NO. Q76447  
GROUP ART NO. 2841

Claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable at least because of their dependency.

### New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 6-10 in order to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and is therefore allowable at least because of its dependency. Claim 7 is allowable over the cited reference at least because it recites a second end of a flap, opposite a first end of the flap, which is joined to a second edge as claimed.

### Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 30, 2006

  
Stephen R. Valancius  
Registration No. 57,574